

PRIME FILTERS IN MV-ALGEBRAS II

COLIN G. BAILEY

ABSTRACT. In this document we consider the prime and maximal spectra of an MV-algebra with certain natural operations. Several new MV-algebras are constructed in this fashion.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the representation theorems for MV-algebras of Martinez ([2, 3]) and Martinez & Priestley ([4]) much use was made of the function on filters: $a \mapsto \mathcal{F}_a = \{z \mid z \rightarrow a \notin \mathcal{F}\}$. For a fixed lattice filter $\mathcal{F}$ the set $\{\mathcal{F}_a \mid a \in \mathcal{L}\}$ was shown to be linearly ordered. In a previous paper [1] we defined the kernel of a filter and showed how to compute the kernel of several natural filters. In this paper we extend this analysis by generalising the definition of kernel. We are able to show that the class of prime lattice filters of an MV-algebra naturally decomposes into linearly ordered MV-algebras. We also relate these operations to those defined in [2, 3] and to other natural operations.

Definition 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be any order filter. The set*

$$\mathcal{F}_a = \{z \mid z \rightarrow a \notin \mathcal{F}\}$$

is called the subordinate of $\mathcal{F}$ at a .

We will primarily be considering the case when $\mathcal{F}$ is prime which implies that $\mathcal{F}_a$ is also a prime filter.

Definition 1.2. *The kernel of an order filter $\mathcal{F}$ is the set*

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \{z \mid \forall a \notin \mathcal{F} \ z \rightarrow a \notin \mathcal{F}\}.$$

The prime spectrum of a prime implication filter P is

$$PSpec(P) = \{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = P\}.$$

We distinguish the special case of $a = 0$ with the notation:

$$\mathcal{F}^+ = \mathcal{F}_0.$$

$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ is an implication filter contained in $\mathcal{F}$ and is prime iff $\mathcal{F}$ is prime. In [1] we showed that

Proposition 1.3. *If $a \notin \mathcal{F}$ then $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}_a)$.*

The definition of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ can clearly be generalised to the following:

Definition 1.4. *If $\mathcal{F}$ is any prime lattice filter and $X \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ let*

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; X) = \bigcap_{a \in X} \mathcal{F}_a.$$

Date: July 20, 2009.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 06D35.

Key words and phrases. MV-algebras, prime filters.

Clearly we have – if $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ then

- (a) $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; X)$ is a filter – as it is the intersection of filters.
- (b) $\mathcal{F}_a = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; \{a\})$ for $a \notin \mathcal{F}$;
- (c) $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{F})$;
- (d) $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; X)$ depends only on $X/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ – as $\eta(a) = \eta(b)$ iff $\mathcal{F}_a = \mathcal{F}_b$.
- (e) if $X \downarrow = \{z \mid \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \ z \leq \bigvee_i x_i\}$ then $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; X) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; X \downarrow)$ – since $z \leq x$ implies $\mathcal{F}_x \subseteq \mathcal{F}_z$ and $\mathcal{F}_{a \vee b}$ is always either $\mathcal{F}_a$ or $\mathcal{F}_b$.

Because of part (e) we need only consider $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; I)$ when I is a lattice ideal. A particular case gives us the following definition.

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two prime lattice filters with $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}; \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{G}).$$

We extend this definition to all $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ by defining

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

We intend to show that there are naturally defined sets of prime filters closed under this operation, that are MV-algebras, with order being reverse inclusion.

2. BASIC FACTS

Here are some of the easier facts about this operation.

Proposition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \{z \mid \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \ f \otimes z \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} &\iff \forall a \notin \mathcal{G} \ z \rightarrow a \notin \mathcal{F} \\ &\iff \forall a \notin \mathcal{G} \ \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \neg(f \leq z \rightarrow a) \\ &\iff \forall a \notin \mathcal{G} \ \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \neg(f \otimes z \leq a) \\ &\iff \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \ z \otimes f \notin \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{G} \\ &\iff \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \ z \otimes f \in \mathcal{G}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.2. $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. As if $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ then $1 \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $z = 1 \otimes z \in \mathcal{G}$. □

Proposition 2.3. If $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ then $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$.

Proof. As $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$. □

Proposition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2$. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}_2.$$

Proof. Let $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}_1$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $z \otimes f \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and so must be in $\mathcal{G}_2$. □

Proposition 2.5. Let $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. Let $z \in \mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_1$. Then $f \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and so $z \otimes f \in \mathcal{G}$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}^+.$$

Proof. Let $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $a \notin \mathcal{F}^+$. Then $\neg a \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $z \otimes \neg a = \neg(z \rightarrow a) \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence $z \rightarrow a \notin \mathcal{G}^+$.

Thus we have $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}^+$.

And so $\mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{F}^{++} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^{++} = \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. $\square$

Proposition 2.7.

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}.$$

Proof. We have $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ from proposition 2.2.

If $f \in \mathcal{F}$ then for any $k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ we have $f \otimes k \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence $f \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}$. $\square$

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \text{ iff } \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. We note that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ iff $\forall f \in \mathcal{F} \forall h \in \mathcal{H} f \otimes h \in \mathcal{G}$ is symmetric in $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$. $\square$

Proposition 2.9.

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. We may assume that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then we see that $x \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})$ iff $\forall f \in \mathcal{F} \forall h \in \mathcal{H} (x \otimes f) \otimes h \in \mathcal{G}$. As $\otimes$ is associative, this is symmetric in $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ and so we have equality. $\square$

2.1. Martinez' Φ function. In [3] Martinez defined the binary function on lattice filters

$$\Phi(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{y \mid f \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

We note that this can be defined in terms as $\rightsquigarrow$ and $\bullet^+$ as $(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+$, as we have

$$\begin{aligned} z \in \Phi(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) &\text{ iff } \exists f \in \mathcal{F} f \rightarrow y = \neg f \oplus y \in \mathcal{G} \\ &\text{ iff } \neg(\forall f \in \mathcal{F} \neg f \oplus y \notin \mathcal{G}) \\ &\text{ iff } \neg(\forall f \in \mathcal{F} f \otimes \neg y \in \mathcal{G}^+) \\ &\text{ iff } \neg(\neg z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+) \\ &\text{ iff } \neg(z \notin (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+) \\ &\text{ iff } z \in (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+. \end{aligned}$$

We note that in any MV-algebra $\neg(f \rightarrow \neg g) = f \otimes g$ and so, in some sense, we have

$$\Phi(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}.$$

3. SENSITIVITY TO KERNELS

The definition of $\rightsquigarrow$ exhibits some interesting sensitivity to kernels of the filters involved as the next couple of results show us.

For a given implication filter P we let $\eta_P: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}/P$ denote the canonical epimorphism. We usually omit the subscript when P is clear from context.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be any filter and P any implication filter. Then*

$$J_u(\mathcal{F}, P) = \eta_P^{-1}[\mathcal{F}/P].$$

Clearly $\mathcal{F} \subseteq J_u(\mathcal{F}, P)$ and J_u is prime or trivial. In [1] we showed that if P is prime and J_u is nontrivial then

$$\mathcal{K}(J_u(\mathcal{F}, P)) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \vee P.$$

Proposition 3.2. $J_u(\mathcal{F}, P)$ is the smallest filter $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying:

- (a) $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$;
- (b) $P \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}$ have the two properties listed. Then $\mathcal{F}/P \subseteq \mathcal{H}/P$ and so $J_u(\mathcal{F}, P) = \eta_P^{-1}[\mathcal{F}/P] \subseteq \eta_P[\mathcal{H}/P] = \mathcal{H}$ (as $P \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$). $\square$

We also need the dual notion

$$J_d(\mathcal{F}, P) = \left(\eta_P^{-1}[\mathcal{F}^+/P] \right)^+.$$

As $\mathcal{F}^+ \subseteq J_u(\mathcal{F}^+, P)$ we have $J_d(\mathcal{F}, P) = J_u(\mathcal{F}^+, P)^+ \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. However it may be empty. There are certain situations where J_d produces nontrivial filters (which must be prime).

Lemma 3.3. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime filters. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$.

$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ implies $\mathcal{G}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{F}^+$ and so

$$\eta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}[\mathcal{G}^+/\mathcal{K}] \subseteq \eta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}[\mathcal{F}^+/\mathcal{K}] = \mathcal{F}^+$$

as $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}^+) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$, by proposition 1.3. Hence $\mathcal{F} \subseteq J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))$. $\square$

Proposition 3.4. $J_d(\mathcal{F}, P)$ is the largest filter $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying:

- (a) $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$;
- (b) $P \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. This follows from proposition 3.2 as $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ iff $\mathcal{F}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{H}^+$. $\square$

Proposition 3.5. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime lattice filters. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. The right-to-left inclusion follows from $\mathcal{F} \subseteq J = J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G}))$.

Conversely, if $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $j \in J$ we want to show that $z \otimes j \in \mathcal{G}$.

There is some $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with $f \sim j \pmod{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})}$, and so $z \otimes f \sim z \otimes j$. As $z \otimes f \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under $\sim_{\mathcal{K}}$ we have $z \otimes j \in \mathcal{G}$. $\square$

Corollary 3.6. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime lattice filters. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} &= \mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}^+ \\ &= J_u(\mathcal{G}^+, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}^+)) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}^+ \\ &= \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow J_u(\mathcal{G}^+, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}^+))^+ \\ &= \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})) \end{aligned}$$

as $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}^+)$. $\square$

Theorem 3.7. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime lattice filters. Then

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \rightsquigarrow J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Proof. We note that $\mathcal{K}(J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G}) \vee \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ and so

$$J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})) = J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G}) \vee \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Likewise

$$J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) = J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G}) \vee \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} &= J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \\ &= J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \rightsquigarrow J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})))) \\ &= J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \rightsquigarrow J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \vee \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \\ &= J_u(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})) \rightsquigarrow J_d(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})). \end{aligned}$$

□

From this theorem we see that we can largely reduce our study of $\rightsquigarrow$ to the case when the two filters involved have the same kernel.

The next step is to compute the kernel of $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ when $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ have the same kernel. We begin this by considering the interaction between $\rightsquigarrow$ and quotients.

4. INTERACTION WITH QUOTIENTS

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two lattice filters, and Q any implication filter with $Q \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$. Then*

$$(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})/Q = (\mathcal{F}/Q) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{G}/Q).$$

Proof. Let $[z] \in (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})/Q$ with $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. Then for any $[y] \in \mathcal{F}/Q$ we can assume that $y \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $z \otimes y \in \mathcal{G}$. Thus $[z] \otimes [y] = [z \otimes y] \in \mathcal{G}/Q$.

Conversely, if $[z] \in (\mathcal{F}/Q) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{G}/Q)$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}$, then $[y] \in \mathcal{F}/Q$ and so $[z \otimes y] \in \mathcal{G}/Q$. Since $Q \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$ we know that $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under Q -cosets and so $z \otimes y \in \mathcal{G}$. □

Proposition 4.2. *$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime lattice filters, and Q any implication filter with $Q \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$. Then*

$$\eta_Q^{-1}[\mathcal{F}/Q \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}/Q] = \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. Note that $\eta^{-1}[\mathcal{F}/Q] = \mathcal{F}$ and $\eta^{-1}[\mathcal{G}/Q] = \mathcal{G}$ as $Q \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$.

Let $z \in \eta^{-1}[\mathcal{F}/Q \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}/Q]$, so that $[z]_Q \in \mathcal{F}/Q \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}/Q$. Choose $h \notin \mathcal{G}$. As $Q \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$ this implies $[h]_Q \notin \mathcal{G}/Q$ and so $[z]_Q \rightarrow [h]_Q = [z \rightarrow h]_Q \notin \mathcal{F}/Q$. As $Q \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ we have $z \rightarrow h \notin \mathcal{F}$. Hence $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$.

Conversely, if $z \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $[h]_Q \notin \mathcal{G}/Q$ then $h \notin \mathcal{G}$, so that $z \rightarrow h \notin \mathcal{F}$. Hence $[z]_Q \rightarrow [h]_Q = [z \rightarrow h]_Q \notin \mathcal{F}/Q$. Thus $[z]_Q \in \mathcal{F}/Q \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}/Q$. □

Corollary 4.3. *$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime lattice filters with $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$. Then*

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. We know that $P \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ iff $\eta_P^{-1}[\mathcal{H}/P] = \mathcal{H}$ for any filter $\mathcal{H}$. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$. Then from above we have $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \eta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}[\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{K} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{K}] = \eta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}[(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})/\mathcal{K}]$. □

5. THE KERNEL OF $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be two prime filters with $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$. Then*

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$.

Let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq P$ for some implication filter P . We show that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})$ is properly contained in P . As we already know that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})$ this gives the result.

As P properly extends $\mathcal{K}$ there are P -cosets S, T such that

$$T \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset \neq T \setminus \mathcal{F}$$

$$\text{and } S \cap \mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset \neq S \setminus \mathcal{G}.$$

Pick $b \in S \setminus \mathcal{G}$ and $a \in T \cap \mathcal{F}$. Then $a \rightarrow b \notin \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ as $b \notin \mathcal{G}$ but $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow b = a \vee b \in \mathcal{F}$.

Now pick $b' \in S \cap \mathcal{G}$ and $a' \in T \setminus \mathcal{F}$.

Now either $b' <_{\mathcal{K}} a'$ or $a' <_{\mathcal{K}} b'$.

In the former case we consider that any $c <_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{G}$ then $c <_{\mathcal{K}} b'$ and we have $(a' \rightarrow b') \rightarrow c' <_{\mathcal{K}} (a' \rightarrow b') \rightarrow b' = a' \vee b' \sim_{\mathcal{K}} a' \notin \mathcal{F}$. Hence $(a' \rightarrow b') \rightarrow c \notin \mathcal{F}$ and so $a' \rightarrow b' \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$.

As $a \rightarrow b$ and $a' \rightarrow b'$ are in the same P -coset we see that $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ is not closed under $\sim_P$.

Now the other case – we are forced to take $a' <_{\mathcal{K}} b'$. Therefore $b' = a' \vee b' > a'$ as $a' <_{\mathcal{K}} b'$. Then we get $a' \rightarrow b' = 1 \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and see that we have a P -coset that is both in and out of $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. $\square$

Because this always works we may assume that $\mathcal{K} = \{1\}$ and we are working in a linearly ordered MV-algebra. This simplifies things a lot. However the case where $\mathcal{L}$ is discrete is very easy to understand. Before we consider this case we need some technical results on convexity.

6. CONVEXITY

In what follows we often need to find an element of the algebra with certain order properties that also satisfies some equation. In order to do this we often appeal to a convexity argument that works provided we know suitable bounds and that sets of interest are convex. To that end we have the following technical facts.

Lemma 6.1. *If C is a convex set and $a \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\{z \rightarrow a \mid z \in C\}$ is convex.*

Proof. There are three cases:

Case 1: $C < a$ in which case the set contains only 1.

Case 2: $a < C$. Let $p \rightarrow a < y < q \rightarrow a$ for some $p, q \in C$. Then $q = (q \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a \leq y \rightarrow a \leq p = (p \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a$ and so $y \rightarrow a \in C$. Hence $y = (y \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a$.

Case 3: $a \in C$. So let $p > a$ and $p \rightarrow a < y < 1 = a \rightarrow a$ – any other possibility is like the last case. Then $1 \rightarrow a = a \leq y \rightarrow a \leq (p \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a = p$ so again $y \rightarrow a \in C$. If $y \rightarrow a = 1$ then $a \leq p \rightarrow a < y \leq a$ which is impossible.

Hence $y = (y \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a$ is in the set.

$\square$

The next lemma is immediate.

Lemma 6.2. *If C is a convex set and $a \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\{\neg z \mid z \in C\}$ is convex.*

Lemma 6.3. *If C is a convex set and $a \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\{z \otimes a \mid z \in C\}$ is convex.*

Proof. $z \otimes a = \neg(z \rightarrow \neg a)$ so we can combine the last two results to get this. $\square$

7. THE DISCRETE CASE

Definition 7.1. *A discrete point is a point a with an immediate successor or an immediate predecessor.*

It is easy to show the following propositions.

Proposition 7.2. *If $\mathcal{L}$ has a discrete point then 0 has a successor c .*

Proposition 7.3. *If 0 has successor c then $a \oplus c$ is the successor of every $a < 1$ and $a \ominus c$ is the predecessor of every $a > 0$.*

Theorem 7.4. *If $\mathcal{L}$ is discrete and $\mathcal{F}$ is a filter with $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \{1\}$ then $\mathcal{F}$ is principal.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{F}$ is nonprincipal, and $a \in \mathcal{F}$ then we must have $a \ominus c \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $\neg c \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ – where c is the successor of 0 . $\square$

Thus in the discrete case, the set of filters we are interested in are exactly the principal ones and so the collection of these filters is isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}$.

Hence we will assume that $\mathcal{L}$ is non-discrete.

8. THE NON-DISCRETE CASE

In this case we are really considering filters as cuts and we will set up the usual equivalence of cuts between $]p, 1]$ and $[p, 1]$. We cannot get a good theory if we take all cuts but things work well if we restrict ourselves to cuts with the same kernel. In that case we get an MV-algebra using $\rightsquigarrow$ and $\bullet^+$.

There is really only one axiom that is hard to check and we will work on it indirectly. In what follows we will assume that we are working in a linearly ordered MV-algebra and all filters have kernel $\{1\}$.

Lemma 8.1.

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow]0, 1] = \mathcal{F}^+.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow]0, 1] &\text{ iff } \forall g \notin]0, 1] \ x \rightarrow g \notin \mathcal{F} \\ &\text{ iff } x \rightarrow 0 = \neg x \notin \mathcal{F} \\ &\text{ iff } x \in \mathcal{F}^+. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}_1| \geq 2$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}_2 \neq \{1\}.$$

Proof. Let $f_1 < f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}_1$. Then $f_2 \rightarrow f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}_2$ as if $g \notin \mathcal{F}_2$ then $g < f_1$ and so $(f_2 \rightarrow f_1) \rightarrow g \leq (f_2 \rightarrow f_1) \rightarrow f_1 = f_2 \notin \mathcal{F}_1$. As $f_2 \rightarrow f_1 < 1$ we have the result. $\square$

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}_1| \geq 2$. Then for any filter $\mathcal{G}$ containing $\mathcal{F}_2$*

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. We know that $\mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ so we seek an element of the latter that is not in the former.

We can assume that $\mathcal{G} \neq]0, 1]$ – as in that case we have $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_1^+ \neq \mathcal{F}_2^+ = \mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$, by lemma 8.1.

Let $a_1 < a_2$ in $\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}_1$. Now for any $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{F}_2$ we have $a_i \rightarrow g \in \mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ – since if $h \notin \mathcal{G}$ then we have $h < g$ and so $(a_i \rightarrow g) \rightarrow h < (a_i \rightarrow g) \rightarrow g = a_i \notin \mathcal{F}_1$.

We know that $a_2 \rightarrow a_1 < 1$ is not in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{G})$ and so we can find $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $g' = g \otimes (a_2 \rightarrow a_1) \notin \mathcal{G}$.

If $g' = 0$ then pick $0 < g'' < \mathcal{G}$ and using the fact that $C = [a_1, 1] \setminus \mathcal{F}_1$ is convex, then $\{g \otimes (z \rightarrow a_1) \mid z \in C\}$ is also convex, it contains 0 and $g = g \otimes (a_1 \rightarrow a_1)$ and so must contain g'' .

Thus we may assume that a_2 is chosen so that $g' > 0$. Now $g \otimes (a_2 \rightarrow a_1) > 0$ implies $(a_2 \rightarrow a_1) > \neg g$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} (a_2 \rightarrow a_1) &= (\neg g) \oplus ((a_2 \rightarrow a_1) \ominus (\neg g)) \\ &= (\neg g) \oplus ((a_2 \rightarrow a_1) \otimes g) \\ &= g \rightarrow g'. \end{aligned}$$

We now have $a_2 \rightarrow g \in \mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and we want to show that it is not in $\mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. In fact we have $a_1 \leq (a_2 \rightarrow g) \rightarrow g'$ as

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 \leq (a_2 \rightarrow g) \rightarrow g' &\text{ iff } a_2 \rightarrow g \leq a_1 \rightarrow g' \\ &\text{ iff } (a_1 \rightarrow g') \rightarrow g \leq a_2 \end{aligned}$$

but

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1 \rightarrow g') \rightarrow g &= (g \rightarrow g') \rightarrow a_1 \\ &= (a_2 \rightarrow a_1) \rightarrow a_1 \\ &= a_2. \end{aligned}$$

□

The “associativity” axiom is the most difficult to establish. Here is the easy half.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})_a$$

for all $a \notin \mathcal{G}$.

Let $z \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a \notin \mathcal{G}$ – and so $a < z$. If $z \rightarrow a \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ then $z \rightarrow a \in \mathcal{F}_a$, ie $z \vee a = z \notin \mathcal{F}$ – contradiction. □

8.1. The principal and coprincipal cases. It is somewhat important to eliminate the cases $\mathcal{F} = [p, 1]$ and $\mathcal{F} =]p, 1]$ from consideration but we still need to know what happens for such filters.

Lemma 8.5.

$$]p, 1]^+ = [\neg p, 1].$$

Proof. $x \in]p, 1]^+$ iff $\neg x \notin]p, 1]$ iff $\neg x \leq p$ iff $\neg p \leq x$ so that $]p, 1]^+ = [\neg p, 1]$. □

Proposition 8.6. *Let $0 < p < q < 1$. Then*

$$]q, 1] \rightsquigarrow]p, 1] = [q \rightarrow p, 1].$$

Proof. First we observe that $q \rightarrow p$ is actually in.

If $z \leq p$ then $(q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow z \leq (q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p = q$ and so $(q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow z \notin]q, 1]$.

If $b < q \rightarrow p$ then $q = (q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p < b \rightarrow p$ and so $b \rightarrow p \in]q, 1]$. $\square$

Proposition 8.7. *Let $0 \leq p < q \leq 1$. Then*

$$[q, 1] \rightsquigarrow]p, 1] =]q \rightarrow p, 1].$$

Proof. First we show that $q \rightarrow p$ is not in $[q, 1] \rightsquigarrow]p, 1]$ as $p \notin]p, 1]$ but $q = (q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p \in [q, 1]$.

If $z > q \rightarrow p$ then $z \rightarrow p < q = (q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p$ and so $z \rightarrow p \notin [q, 1]$. $\square$

Proposition 8.8. *Suppose that $0 < p \leq q < 1$. Then*

$$]q, 1] \rightsquigarrow [p, 1] = [q \rightarrow p, 1]$$

where $]q, 1]$ can be either $]q, 1]$ or $[q, 1]$.

Proof. Let $k < q \rightarrow p$. We want to show that there is some $f > q$ with $k \otimes f < p$.

We note that $p \leq q$ implies $q \otimes (q \rightarrow p) = p$. Now if every $f > q$ has $p < f \otimes k$ then we get $q \otimes k < q \otimes (q \rightarrow p) = p < f \otimes k$, which implies the set $\{s \otimes k \mid s \geq q\}$ is not convex. Hence there is some $f > q$ with $f \otimes k = p$.

Now we can find $q < f' < f$ and so $f' \otimes k < f \otimes k = p$.

Finally we have $q \rightarrow p \in [q, 1] \rightsquigarrow [p, 1]$ as if $h < p$ then $(q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow h < (q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p = q$ and so $(q \rightarrow p) \rightarrow h \notin [q, 1]$. $\square$

Corollary 8.9. *If $0 < p < 1$ then*

$$]p, 1] \rightsquigarrow [p, 1] = \{1\}.$$

8.2. The general case. Combining several of the above results, we get the following theorem on filter equivalence.

Theorem 8.10. $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \{1\}$ iff $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{G} = [g, 1]$, $\mathcal{F} =]g, 1]$.

Proof. We know that the right side implies the left from proposition 8.6 and proposition 2.3.

We also know that if $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \{1\}$ then $|\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{F}| < 2$ and so is either zero (ie $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$) or one.

In the latter case if $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ then $\mathcal{G} = [g, 1]$ and $\mathcal{F} =]g, 1]$. $\square$

Corollary 8.11.

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} \neq \{1\} \text{ iff } |\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{F}| \geq 2.$$

9. CUTS

Now we are set to define our basic equivalence relation on filters and show that this naturally produces an MV-algebra.

Definition 9.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two filters in $\mathcal{L}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G} \text{ iff } \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \{1\}.$$

As is usual with cuts (recall $\mathbb{Q}$ giving rise to $\mathbb{R}$) we have that $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$ iff $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ differ by at most one point. This is also true here, as we show below. First we establish that $\equiv$ is a congruence relation.

Theorem 9.2. $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on filters.

Proof. Reflexive is given by $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \{1\}$.

Symmetry is built into the definition.

It remains to prove transitivity, which we take care of in the following lemma. $\square$

Lemma 9.3. Let $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \{1\}$. Then $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \{1\}$.

Proof. From above we know that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{G} = [g, 1]$, $\mathcal{F} =]g, 1]$.

Now if $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ then either $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}$ in which case $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \{1\}$ or $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, in which case we also have $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \{1\}$.

If $\mathcal{H} = [h, 1]$ and $\mathcal{G} =]h, 1]$ then the cases are:

Case 1: $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ and then $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \{1\}$;

Case 2: $\mathcal{G}$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{F}$ in which case $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$;

Case 3: $\mathcal{G} = [g, 1]$ and $\mathcal{F} =]g, 1]$. But now g is the successor of h – contradicting the fact there are no discrete points. $\square$

In order to show that $\equiv$ is a congruence relation, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 9.4. Let $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \{1\}$. Then $(\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$ for any filter $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. This is immediate if $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ as we apply proposition 2.3.

So suppose that $\mathcal{G} = [g, 1]$, $\mathcal{F} =]g, 1]$.

If $\mathcal{H} =]h, 1]$ we apply propositions 8.6 and 8.7 to get the result. Hence we may assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is not coprincipal.

We first show that $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$ cannot differ by two points. Suppose that $a_1 < a_2$ are in $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$ but not in $\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$. Thus if $h \notin \mathcal{H}$ then $a_i \rightarrow h \notin \mathcal{F}$. We know that $a_i \notin \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$ and so there exists $h_1, h_2 \notin \mathcal{H}$ such that $a_i \rightarrow h_i \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{F} = \{g\}$. Hence $a_1 \rightarrow h_1 = a_2 \rightarrow h_2 = g$. As $a_1 < a_2$ this means that $h_1 < h_2$. Hence $a_1 \rightarrow h_2 > a_2 \rightarrow h_2 = g$ and so $a_1 \rightarrow h_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ – contradiction.

If the two sets differ at exactly one point then we must have $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = [p, 1]$ for some p . We want to show that $p \in \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$. We have $p \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$ and so $p \rightarrow h \notin \mathcal{F}$ for all $h \notin \mathcal{H}$.

If $p \notin \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$ then there is some $h \notin \mathcal{H}$ with $p \rightarrow h = g$. As $\mathcal{H}$ is not coprincipal there is some $h < h' < \mathcal{H}$. But now we have $p \rightarrow h = g < p \rightarrow h'$ and so $p \rightarrow h' \in \mathcal{F}$ – contradiction.

So this case cannot happen, and we have $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$. $\square$

Theorem 9.5. $\equiv$ is a congruence wrt $\bullet^+$ and $\bullet \rightsquigarrow \bullet$.

Proof. As $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}^+$ it is immediate that $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$ implies $\mathcal{F}^+ \equiv \mathcal{G}^+$.

From the lemma we can deduce that $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$ implies $\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} \equiv \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}$.

We also have $\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ as $\mathcal{F}^+ \equiv \mathcal{G}^+$ and so $\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^+ \equiv \mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^+ = \mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$.

Finally, if $\mathcal{F}_1 \equiv \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\mathcal{G}_1 \equiv \mathcal{G}_2$ we have $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \equiv \mathcal{F}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}_2 \equiv \mathcal{F}_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}_2$. $\square$

Now we want to know what happens to $(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ when $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.

We know that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ from lemma 8.4 and so we have the following corollary.

Corollary 9.6.

$$\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = ((\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. Taking $\mathcal{F}$ as $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ in the lemma we get $\text{LHS} \subseteq \text{RHS}$.

As $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ applying $\rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ to both sides reverses the inclusion and so $\text{RHS} \subseteq \text{LHS}$. $\square$

Proposition 9.7. *Let $\mathcal{F}_G = (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. Then $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{F}_G$.*

Proof. We know that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_G$ from lemma 8.4.

We also know that $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_G \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. The theorem then implies $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}_G = \{1\}$. $\square$

As usual we define $\leq$ by $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G}$ iff $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \{1\}$. From above we know that $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G}$ iff $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{G} = [g, 1]$ and $\mathcal{F} =]g, 1]$.

Theorem 9.8. *Let P be a prime implication filter. Let*

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_P = \langle \text{PSpec}(P) / \equiv, \bullet^+, \rightsquigarrow \rangle.$$

Then $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_P$ is a linearly ordered MV-algebra.

Proof. (a) $\mathbf{0} =]0, 1] \leq \mathcal{F} \leq \mathbf{1} = \{1\}$ for all $\mathcal{F}$.

(b) $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G}$ iff $\mathcal{G}^+ \leq \mathcal{F}^+$ – by (e).

(c) $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})$ by proposition 2.9.

(d) $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{K}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbf{1}$.

(e) $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}$ by proposition 2.6.

(f) If $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{1}$ then $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$, by definition of $\equiv$.

(g) $(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F}$ as if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ then $(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{F}$ by proposition 9.7.

And $\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}$ by propositions 2.3 and 2.7.

(h) $(\mathcal{F} \vee \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}) \wedge (\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H})$ as we are in a linear order and we have proposition 2.5.

(i) $(\mathcal{F} \wedge \mathcal{G}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}) \vee (\mathcal{G} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H})$ as we are in a linear order and we have proposition 2.5. $\square$

9.1. Another look at Φ . Inside $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_P$ we define $\otimes$ in terms of $\rightsquigarrow$ and $\bullet^+$ as usual in MV-algebras:

$$\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+.$$

We noted above (see subsection 2.1) that

$$\Phi(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}.$$

Another natural way to define $\otimes$ is to use the operation of $\mathcal{L}$ directly and let

$$T(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \{f \otimes g \mid f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } g \in \mathcal{G}\} \uparrow.$$

Proposition 9.9. *If $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are in $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_P$ then*

$$T(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. Consider the ideal

$$I = \{y \mid (y \oplus \mathcal{G}^*) \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset\}.$$

(i) $I \cap T = \emptyset$.

If $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$ then $f \otimes g \in I$ as $\neg f \in \mathcal{G}^*$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} (f \otimes g) \oplus \neg g &= \neg(\neg f \oplus \neg g) \oplus \neg g \\ &= (f \rightarrow \neg g) \rightarrow \neg g \\ &= f \vee \neg g \in \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $y \notin I$ then $y \in T$.

If $y \notin I$ then there is some $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $y \oplus \neg g \in \mathcal{F}$. But then we have $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $g \rightarrow y = y \oplus \neg g \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $g \otimes (g \rightarrow y) \leq y$ implies $y \in T$.

(iii) $\mathcal{L} \setminus I = (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+$ as

$$\begin{aligned} y \in (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+ &\text{ iff } \neg y \notin \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+ \\ &\text{ iff } \exists k \notin \mathcal{G}^+ \neg y \rightarrow k \in \mathcal{F} \\ &\text{ iff } \exists k \neg k \in \mathcal{G} \text{ and } y \oplus k = \neg y \rightarrow k \in \mathcal{F} \\ &\text{ iff } \exists k k \in \mathcal{G}^* \text{ and } y \oplus k \in \mathcal{F} \\ &\text{ iff } (y \oplus \mathcal{G}^*) \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$T = \mathcal{L} \setminus I = (\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}^+)^+ = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}.$$

□

10. CONNECTING THE PIECES

In this section we consider how the algebras $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_P$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_Q$ are related to one another when $P \subseteq Q$. And we consider the connection with the quotient $\mathcal{L}/P$.

Definition 10.1. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a prime lattice filter and P a prime implication filter that properly contains $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$. $q_P(\mathcal{F})$ is the unique P -coset C such that $C \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset \neq C \setminus \mathcal{F}$.

Theorem 10.2. Let $P \subseteq Q$ be two prime implication filters. Then

$$\hat{\eta}_{PQ}: \hat{\mathcal{L}}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{L}/Q$$

defined by

$$\hat{\eta}_{PQ}(\mathcal{F}) = q_Q(\mathcal{F})$$

is an MV-morphism.

Proof. It is enough to do the case when $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}/P$.

First we show that $q(\mathcal{F}^+) = \neg q(\mathcal{F})$.

Let $x \in \mathcal{F} \cap q(\mathcal{F})$. Then $\neg x \notin \mathcal{F}^+$ as $\neg^2 x = x \in \mathcal{F}$. But $\neg x \in \neg q(\mathcal{F})$ and so $\neg q(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \mathcal{F}^+ \neq \emptyset$.

If $x \in q(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \mathcal{F}$ then $\neg x \in \mathcal{F}^+$ and so $\neg q(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{F}^+ \neq \emptyset$.

Now we want to show that

$$q(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) = q(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow q(\mathcal{G}).$$

We saw in the proof that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ that if $b \in q(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \mathcal{G}$ and $a \in q(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ that $a \rightarrow b \notin \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$. Also if $b' \in q(\mathcal{G}) \cap \mathcal{G}$ and $a' \in q(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \mathcal{F}$ then $a' \rightarrow b' \in \mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$.

Hence the coset $q(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ crosses the boundary of $\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G}$ and so must be $q(\mathcal{F} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{G})$. □

Note that we also have an MV-morphism $\iota_P: \mathcal{L}/P \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{L}}_P$ defined by

$$\iota_P([a]_P) = P_a$$

Theorem 10.3. If $\mathcal{L}/P$ is non-discrete then ι_P is an injective MV-morphism.

Proof. We know that $P_a = P_b$ iff $\eta_P(a) = \eta_P(b)$ and so ι must be injective.

From proposition 4.2 and proposition 8.6 we know that $P_a \rightsquigarrow P_b = \eta_P^{-1}[P_a/P \rightsquigarrow P_b/P] = \eta_P^{-1}[[a]_P, \mathbf{1}] \rightsquigarrow [[b]_P, \mathbf{1}]] = \eta_P^{-1}[[a \rightarrow b]_P, \mathbf{1}]] \equiv \eta_P[[a \rightarrow b]_P, \mathbf{1}]]$. Hence ι preserves $\rightsquigarrow$.

And $P_a^+ = \eta_P^{-1}[[a]_P, \mathbf{1}]^+ = \eta_P^{-1}[[\neg a]_P, \mathbf{1}] \equiv \eta_P^{-1}[[\neg a]_P, \mathbf{1}] = P_{\neg a}$ and so ι preserves negation. $\square$

And finally we put the pieces together and see that $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_P$ interpolates $\eta_{PQ}: \mathcal{L}/P \rightarrow \mathcal{L}/Q$.

Theorem 10.4. *The composite mapping*

$$\mathcal{L}/P \xrightarrow{\iota_P} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_P \xrightarrow{\hat{\eta}_{PQ}} \mathcal{L}/Q$$

is just $[a]_P \mapsto [a]_Q$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $P \subseteq Q$ implies $q_Q(P_a) = [a]_Q$. Let $q \in Q \setminus P$ and so there is some $f \notin P_a$ such that $q \rightarrow f \in P_a$.

We know that $P_a/P = [a]_P, \mathbf{1}$ and so $f \leq_P a$. Hence $f \leq_Q a$. As $q \rightarrow f \in P_a$ we have $a <_P q \rightarrow f$ and so $a \leq_Q q \rightarrow f$.

As $[f]_Q = [q \rightarrow f]_Q$ we have $[f]_Q = [a]_Q$ is the Q -boundary coset. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] C. G. Bailey, *The Prime Filters of an MV-Algebra*, in preparation, available at [arXiv:0907.3328v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.3328v1)[math.RA].
- [2] Nestor G. Martinez, *A Simplified Duality Theorem for Implicative Lattices and ℓ -Groups*, *Studia Logica* **56** (1996), 185–204.
- [3] ———, *A topological duality for some lattice ordered algebraic structures including ℓ -groups*, *Algebra Universalis* **31** (1994), 516–541.
- [4] Nestor G. Martinez and H.A. Priestley, *Uniqueness of MV-algebra implication and de Morgan negation*, *Mathware & Soft Computing* **2** (1995), 229–245.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS & OPERATIONS RESEARCH, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND,
E-mail address: Colin.Bailey@vuw.ac.nz